

ROME

TYRANNOUS

Idolatrous and Heretick.

The Origine of Her Errors,

WITH

An Answer to Her Objections.

By Peter Berault.

Lately Chaplain of His Majesty's
Ships the *Kent* and *Victory*.

Gal. 3. 1. O Foolish! who has blinded you
that ye should not obey the Truth.

London, Printed by W. Redman for
the Author, and are to be Sold by
Richard Parker at the Unicorn under
the Royal Exchange. 1698.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A New, Short, and exact Latin Grammar, wherein all that is dark, and deficient in other Grammars, is plain, and methodically supply'd: whereby every one may easily and speedily attain that Language. With a Vocabulary of things most usual in ordinary discourse. Also the Latin Particles necessary to be known by any that are desirous either to make elegant Latin, or understand Authors. Printed for R. Parker at the Unicorn under the Royal Exchange.

Also a Treatise of Logick and Moral Philosophy both in French and English, with Physick and Metaphysick in Latin, by P. Berault.

If any Gentlemen have a mind to learn these two Languages, he will wait upon them. You may hear of him, either in White-cross-alley the second Moor-fields, next door to the Cloth-workers-Arms, or at Mr. Parker Bookseller under the Royal Exchange.

ERRATA.

IN the running Title, and in the a. page. J. 15. instead of Idolater, r. Idolatrous, and so in the 13. p. the last line, p. 14. l. 6. and 17. p. 40. l. 2. p. 45. l. 21. instead of Idolatry r. Idolatrous, and l. 1. for *Oratio* read *Oraculo*.

T O .

His Excellency

The Right Honourable

John L. Summers

Lord Baron of Evesham, High
Chancellor of England, one
of the Lords of His Majesty's
most Honourable Privy Coun-
cil, and one of the Lords
Justices of England, during
the Absence of His Majesty.

May it Please your Excellency,

R O M E, who in for-
mer Ages was both
Holy and Orthodox,
is now corrupted not only in

Dedication.

Her Manners, but also in
Her Doctrinē. Yet She is so
Confident, as to accuse of
Impiety and Heresie all the
Protestant Churches of *Eng-
land, Holland, Germany,* and
other Countries; and perem-
ptorily affirm, unless they be
of Her Communion, they
must never expect to be sav'd.
And so I may say without
any passion, that She is like
those Lewd and Naughty
Women, who quarrelling
with those, that are Honest,
do immediately call them
infamous and opprobrious
Names, lest the same should
be justly retorted upon Them-
selves. I do not here intend
to speak of the Vices of the
Church

Dedication.

Church of *Rome*, since most of 'em, to our Shame, are too frequently found amongst us; I will only make mention of Her Tyrannies, Idolatries and Heresies, which, thanks be to God, are not yet seen in Reformed Churches, and were the true Reasons, why I left my Native Country, and came hither to live and end my days.

I know a different Construction will be made by the Papists, as also by some Protestants; for, as *St. Paul*, being newly converted to the Christian Religion, was not only hated by the *Jews*, some of them making an Oath, they would neither eat nor

Dedication.

drink, till they had kill'd him;
but even was suspected by the
Apostles themselves, who
were for some time afraid to
converse with him. So when
a Man leaves the Errors of
the Church of Rome, and em-
braces the Truths of the Pro-
testant Religion, then all the
Zealots of his former Opi-
nion do presently Anathema-
tize him; and those, who
were his most intimate
Friends, become his greatest
Enemies. And that, which
most aggravates his Trouble,
is, that the Protestants, a-
mongst whom he came to se-
cure himself, do commonly
doubt of the Sincerity of his
Conversion, and are very shy
of

Dedication.

of putting Confidence in him.

He that has powerful Enemies, stands in need of a mighty Protection ; and this is the reason, My Lord, why I do here, under God, implore yours ; which I do not in the least question, since you are an Enemy to the *Romish* Errors, and have a great Love for the Truth of the Reformed Religion, and no less Tenderness and Affection for them, that courageously defend it.

The Three Sermons, I have lately presented to your Excellency, were so kindly receiv'd, that I thought, I was obliged upon the first opportunity to make some acknowledgment.

Dedication.

knowledge to your Excellency by dedicating this small Treatise. I should not offer you a Present of so little value, had I not this to encourage me, that it is not the Gift, but the Intention in giving, which finds acceptance with Great and Generous Minds.

I do not here intend to attempt an enumeration of all your excellent Qualities. I will only say, that every one admires your solid Judgment, extraordinary Prudence, and wise Conduct in the high Places you are in, as well as in all the Affairs you undertake, either Publick or Private; that *England* doth find
in

Dedication.

in you both Equity and Integrity in the Administration of Justice ; and that our very Prudent, and most Generous King *William*, having chosen you amongst so many Learned Lawyers to be Chancellor of *England*, one of the Lords of his most Honourable Privy-Council ; and one of the Lords Justices of *England*, during his Absence, is a certain Proof of your Merits, and the best Commendation of your eminent Virtues.

These Virtues, My Lord, will render your Name Immortal to Posterity, and will leave a lively Idea of your Renown, which will serve to influence your Example to all

suc-

Dedication.

succeeding Ages. I abhor Flattery, but I love Justice; and in all that I have said here to your Excellency, every body is obliged to declare, or with Silence give their Consent, that I only give Honour to whom Honour is due.

I ask your Excellency's Pardon, for the Liberty I have taken. I pray God Almighty, that you may live long and healthful in the high Places, wherein you so worthily acquit yourself. I wish you every thing, that may contribute to make you intirely Happy in this World; and, when in the other you are call'd at the Judgment-Seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, you may

Dedication.

may hear these comfortable words; Come you Blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the Foundation of the World. It is, and shall be, as long as I live, the earnest Prayer of him, that is with Sincerity and Respect,

Your Excellency's

Most Humble

Most Obedient, and

Most Affectionate Servant

P. Berault.

MON SEIGNEUR
SUMMERS
CHANCELIER
D'ANGLETERRE.

EPIGRAMME.

Sage, & Juste Summers, ta profonde Science,

Jointe à ta grande Probité

Demande que par Equité

Chacun par tout te rende Homage, & Reverence.

On dit que la Justice, & que la Verité

Ne sont plus icy sur la Terre ;

Il est Faux ; car dans l'Angleterre

Summers, par un beau Don de la Divinité,

Possède l'une & l'autre en leur Intégrité.

P. Berault.

R O M E.

Tyrannous, Idolater, and Heretick.

THE Church of *Rome* may be now compared to the Image of *Nebuchadnezzar*; for as his Head was of fine Gold, his Breast and Arms of Silver, his Belly and his Thighs of Brass, his Legs of Iron, and his Feet part of Iron and part of Clay: So, when we look upon the Ancient Church of *Rome*, She was then as pure as Gold. But when we come to the following Ages, we do find in her so notable a change; that we do now see in her an Iron-Age, and quite different from the former. I do not

B

here

2 Rome, *Tyrannous*,
here intend to imitate several Authors ; who even, when they compose but a small Book, are wont to make a long Preface. They build, as the Proverb saith, the Door bigger than the House. They do promise much, and perform but little. That I may not be guilty of the fault, which I do here impute to others, I immediately enter into my Subject, and prove *per Argumentum ad Hominem*, that is, by the very Principles of the Church of *Rome*, that She is *Tyrannous*, *Idolater*, and *Heretick*.

I. I shew that She is Cruel and Tyrannous ; for all those, that contrary to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ and Law of Nature, do persecute Men, and cause them to die, meerly because they are not of their Opinion and Religion, are Cruel and Tyrannous.

The Church of *Rome*, contrary to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, and Law of Nature, does persecute
Men,

Men, and cause them to die, meerly because they are not of her Opinion and Religion :

Therefore She is Cruel and Tyrannous.

The Major Proposition of this Argument is true; as for the Minor, which is in question, I prove it thus.

It is evident, that the *Roman* Church does persecute Men, and cause them to die, meerly, because they are not of her Opinion and Religion. The rigorous Laws of her Inquisition, whereby She did persecute an innumerable number of Men, and cause them to die, meerly, because they were not of Her Opinion and Religion, is a convincing proof of what I say. And that it is contrary to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ and Law of Nature to persecute Men, and cause them to die, because they are not of our Opinion and Religion, I shall endeavour to prove it evidently.

1. I say that this Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, by Persecuting Men, and causing them to Die, meerly because they are not of her Opinion and Religion, is contrary to Christ's Doctrine. For Jesus Christ going to Worship at *Hierusalem*, the *Samaritans*, who were of another Religion, refusing to receive him in his Journey, two of his Disciples, *James* and *John* presently took Fire, and out of a well-meaning Zeal for their Master, and of the true God, and of *Hierusalem* the true place of Worship, asked leave to dispatch out of the way these Enemies of God and Christ, and the true Religion. And to this end they desired our Saviour to give them Power to call for Fire from Heaven to consume them. Jesus Christ seeing them in this heat, which seem'd to be well-meaning, did very calmly, but severely reprove this Temper of theirs; saying, *The Son of Man is*
not

Idolater, and Heretick. 5

not come to destroy Mens lives, but to save them. Luke 9. 56. You own your selves to be my Disciples, but do you consider what Spirit now Acts and Governs you? Not that surely which I do teach you, which is not furious Persecuting and destructive Spirit, but mild, gentle, and aiming at nothing but to save Men's Lives, even of our greatest Enemies. This Spirit of Persecuting and Destroying one another about Religion, is contrary to the Intention, for which I came into the World. For I am not come to destroy Men's Lives, but to save them. Ye ought to love one another, even your greatest Enemies; and far from giving you leave to Persecute them, I forbid you to hate those who Persecute you. If I would destroy my Enemies, and the Hereticks that are not of my Religion, could I not do it by the Power which I have received from my Father; and could I

6 / Rome, Tyrannous,

not obtain of him a Legion of Angels to destroy them? But my Intention is not that Religion should be propagated in this cruel Method, but by Meekness and Perswasion. I will have Men to be drawn to the Profession of it by the Bonds of Love and Conviction. *If any Man, saith he, will be my Disciple, if any Man will come after me.* And when his Disciples were leaving him, he does not, as they do in Rome and Spain, set up an Inquisition to Torture and Punish them for their Defection from the Faith; only says, *will ye also go away?* And in imitation of this blessed Pattern the Christian Church continued to speak and act for several Ages. This was also the Language of the Holy Fathers and the Style of Councils; they said that *the Christian Law doth not avenge it self by the Sword.* Lex nova non se vindicat ultore gladio; and that we must not offer Violence to no Man, to compel him to Faith.

Faith. Nemini ad credendum vim inferre. And *Gregorius ad Episc. Constant,* Writes thus. *Nova & inaudita predicatio quæ verberibus exigit Fidem.* This sort of Preaching is new and strange, which extorts Faith by Whips and Scourges. If *Hereticks* were to be Persecuted and Destroyed, the *Samaritans*, who were true Hereticks, and had affronted our Saviour himself, the Honour of God and of Religion, ought certainly to be punished. And to shew the contrary, Jesus Christ does severely rebuke his Disciples that had a great mind to destroy them, saying unto them, *Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of;* and he gives them such a Reason, as ought in all Differences of Religion, how wide soever they be, to deter Men from this Temper; for, saith he, *The Son of Man is not come to destroy Men's Lives, but to save them.*

What

What can then the Church of *Rome* plead for her Persecution to Men for the cause of Religion, which *James* and *John* might not much better have pleaded for themselves against the *Samaritans*? Does she practice these Severities out of a Zeal for the Honour of God, of Christ, and the true Religion? Upon these very Accounts it was that *James* and *John* would have called for Fire from Heaven to have destroyed the *Samaritans*. Is she perswaded, that those whom she Persecutes are Hereticks, and that no Punishment can be too great for such Offenders? So *James* and *John* were perswaded of the *Samaritans*; and upon much better Grounds than those of the Church of *Rome*; for Jesus Christ does excuse them, saying, *Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of*. But in the Church of *Rome*, and especially in the Governing part of it; this Excuse cannot be brought for

a

a good Plea ; for the Christian Religion, which they do Profess, forbids them Persecution. And it is no more evident in the New Testament that Jesus Christ was born, died, and rose up for Sinners, than it is manifest that Christians ought not to Persecute one another for the Mis-belief of any Article of Revealed Religion ; much less when these Articles are invented by Men, or are imposed as only Ceremonies.

I know that those that live in the *Roman Church*, are not all of this Opinion, that all Hereticks, or those that are not of their Opinion ought to be Persecuted and put to Death. I knew some of them in *France*, which were of a better and more Christian Principles ; yet it is too true that this hellish Doctrine is taught and practised among them. Their several and frequent Conspiracies in *England*, their cruel and horrible Massacres in *Ireland*,

to Rome, Tyrannous,

land, France, and other Countries ; as we may read in the History, their severe and damnable Inquisition in Italy and Spain ; their rigorous Persecutions towards our poor Brethren of the Reformed Church in France, which was these several years, and is at present so extreme, that I should be too long, if I would write it down in this Treatise ; and the very words of the Council of Latran, are a certain Proof of what I say. *If a Temporal Lord, saith this Council, be required and warned by the Church to Purge his Country from this foul Heresie, does neglect it, let him be Excommunicated by the Metropolitan Bishop ; and from that time let him Denounce his Subjects, discharged of their Allegiance, and let him give his Country to be Possessed by the Catholics.* And in the next words, several Priviledges and great Indulgences are granted to all Men that shall

shall endeavour to destroy the Hereticks.

2. I make it appear, that this Doctrine of Persecuting and Destroying those which are not of our Opinion and Religion, is contrary to the Law of Nature. For this is the Law of Nature, *As ye would that Men should do unto you, so do you unto them.* We would not be Persecuted and Destroyed for our Opinion and Religion; therefore we ought not to Persecute and Destroy others.

But some will object, we have a Law, and by this Law they ought to be Persecuted and Destroyed.

I Answer, if that were a sufficient Reason to warrant Persecution, we could not blame the *Jews*, when they Crucified Jesus Christ; for they said, *They had a Law, and that by this Law he ought to die.* And we could not blame Queen *Mary*, who by a Law in her days, caused so many

many to suffer Martyrdom; nor could we now blame the Papists, who by their Laws in *France, Italy* and *Spain*, establish Cruelty and Oppression; and as so many *Nebuchadnezzars* give Order, that all Persons that will not Worship their God of Bread, or refuse to bow before their Images, or will not believe what they believe, be Persecuted, Tortured, and put to Death by the most cruel Torments.

If any Man be found a Plotter, or breed Sedition and Disturbance in a Kingdom; if he contrive any Evil against the King or Government, he ought to be Punish'd according to the Law of this Kingdom. But if he only be found Erring concerning some Articles of Religion, he ought to be Taught and Admonish'd by the Bishop, and afterwards rejected from the Congregation, if he will not be perswaded. But he ought not to be cast into Prison, nor deprived of
his

his Estate, nor sent to the Gallies, nor Condemned to Die. For this Cruelty, as I have already shewed, is not only contrary to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, but to the Law of Nature also. And therefore it is evident, that the Church of *Rome* is Cruel and Tyrannous; since contrary to Christ's Doctrine and the Law of Nature, she Persecutes and puts Men to Death, meerly because they are not of her Opinion and Religion.

The Origine, or the Author of this hellish Doctrine was a Dominican Fryar, or rather the King *Nebuchadnezzar*; for as he that would not Worship his Image, was cast into a fiery Furnace; so those that will not Worship the God of Bread of the Papists, and bow to their Images, are Condemn'd to be burnt alive.

Secondly, I shew that the *Roman Church* is Idolater.

All those, that do Worship the Creature for the Creator, are Idolaters.

The Church of *Rome* does Worship the Creature for the Creator; Therefore she is an Idolater.

The Major Proposition of this Argument is true, and is granted by all Divines. As for the Minor, which is in question, I prove it thus.

The Church of *Rome* does Worship a bit of Bread baked upon the Fire, and takes it for her God; therefore she does Worship the Creature for the Creator; therefore she is an Idolater.

That the *Roman* Church Worships a bit of Bread baked upon the Fire, and takes it for her God; this does clearly appear, since she believes that the Bread being Consecrated by her Priests, is really Transubstantiated, or changed into the true Body of Jesus Christ, and renders unto it the very same
Ado-

the Adoration that we render to the
do Godhead. And that it is false that
or this Bread Consecrated by her
Priests, be really changed into the
true Body of Jesus Christ. I will
make it evidently appear, because
his this Doctrine of theirs is contrary
ed to the Holy Scripture, to Senses, to
or Reason, and to the Holy Fathers.

1. I say that it is contrary to the
Holy Scripture, that the Bread
Consecrated by her Priests, be real-
ly changed into the true Body of
Jesus Christ, and consequently be
here still upon Earth; for Jesus
Christ being about to leave the
World, and his Disciples afflicting
themselves upon this account, he
doth not comfort them by saying,
I leave you my Body under the
Species of Bread and Wine, but he
tells them, *The Poor ye have with
you, but me ye have not always; I
came forth from the Father, and am
come into the world, again I leave
the world and go to the Father.* He

tells them that his Father will Protect them, will send them his holy Spirit, and that he is going to prepare them a place in Heaven. He tells them of his Intercession, and of his second coming to Judge both the quick and the dead, and *that the Heavens must receive him until the time of the restitution of all things.*

John 12. 8, 16, 28. Acts 3. 21. and in the 24th Chapter of St. *Mat.*

26 Verse, it is written, that a time will come, when they shall say, *Lo, here is Christ, or there, behold he is in the secret Chambers, and that we must not believe it.*

By these words, it appears clearly, that it is contrary to the holy Scripture, that the Body of Jesus Christ be yet here upon *Earth*, and consequently, that the Bread Consecrated by the Priests, be really changed into his Body.

Object. Jesus Christ, saith the *Roman Church*, took Bread, and gave Thanks, and said, *Take ye and eat,*

eat, this is my body which is broken for you. Matth. 26. 1 Cor. 11. 24. Jesus Christ, saith the Roman Church, is true, he has said in giving the Bread, *This is my Body*; therefore this Bread ought to be changed into the true Body of Jesus Christ; therefore he is here still upon Earth. And to shew, she saith, that it is not the Figure of Jesus Christ, and these words, *This is my Body*, are not Metaphorical, because he said, *which is broken for you*. Now it is not the Figure of Jesus Christ, which was broken for us, but his true Body.

Answer, It is certain that Jesus Christ is true; and though he said, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, and that it was the true Body of Jesus Christ which was broken for us, and not the Figure; yet that doth not hinder these words from being Metaphorical; and to let you see it clearly, observe my Reason. *This is my Body which*

was broken for you, (is) that is to say, signifieth or representeth. As you may see in several other Texts of the holy Scripture; as for Example in this. *The Rock was Christ,* where this word, *(was)* means, *did signifie or represent. which is broken for you;* the Relative, *(which)* does not serve to shew the Transubstantiation; or that the Bread is changed into the true Body of Jesus Christ, because it is related to this Word *(Body)* and not to the Proposition, *This is my Body.* It has a relation to the Attribute, and not to the Subject. That which hinders not this Proposition from being Metaphorical, no more than *this, the Rock was Christ.* For if the Evangelist had added, which was Crucified, or which was raised again; as the Relative *(which)* would not hinder this Proposition from being Metaphorical; likewise these words, *which was broken for you,* hinder not the other Proposition from being Improper and Metaphorical.

Mark

Mark, that his Body was not broken before he Suffered upon *Golgotha*: How did he say then, *which is broken*, before it was broken? There is no sense of it but this. The Bread was broken, and signified that his Body should be broken. Now, as the breaking of the Bread did signifie the breaking of his Body, so the Bread must signifie his Body: And as his Body was not broken indeed, when the Bread was broken; so the Bread could not be his Body indeed, for then his Body should have been broken, when the Bread was broken.

If because Christ saith, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, they will have these words to be expounded literally; why then do they not expound the other words of Christ literally also concerning the Cup? For the Text saith, that he took the Cup, and said, *This is my Blood*. I am sure that those of the Church of *Rome* will not say that the Cup was the

the Blood of Christ, as the words declare it to be, but that there is a Figure in these words, namely, *Contineus pro Contento*; that by the Cup is meant the Wine in it. If then they will admit a Figure in this Proposition, why there may not be a Figure in the other; namely, *Signatum pro Signo*; that these words, *This is my Body*, should be understood thus, the Bread is a sign of my Body.

I may prove as well, that Christ is a Door, because he saith, *I am the Door*; and that he is a Vine, because he saith, *I am a Vine*; for his sayings are alike. But Figurative Speeches must not be construed literally. Now, that they may see, that not we only say, 'tis Bread and Wine after Consecration, Jesus Christ himself doth call them so. *I will drink no more*, saith he, *of the fruit of the Vine*. Jesus Christ assures, that it was the fruit of the Vine which he drank; therefore

Wine

Wine and not Blood was his drink; therefore after Consecration, Wine was still Wine. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. c. 11. does confirm it, when he plainly saith, that *the Communicant doth eat Bread*. Therefore the Bread remains Bread after the words of Consecration: For, if it were transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, then were there no Bread to eat; the Body of Christ should be the thing that should be eaten, and consequently should not be called Bread.

What I say may be seen by these words of Jesus Christ, wherein he assures us, *That he was the bread of life which came down from Heaven, which if any man eat, he shall live for ever*, John 6. 50. His Disciples hearing these words, murmured until he had expounded them. And how did he expound them? thus, *He that comes unto me, has eaten; and he that believes in me has drunk*. Afterwards, when He Instituted

22 Rome, Tyrannous,

stituted this Sacrament in like words, they murmured not, which they would as before, if he had not resolved them before, that, to eat his Body, and to drink his Blood, was nothing but to come to him, and believe in him. For, as it is plainly said, *This is my Body*, so it is plainly said, *These words are Spirit*, that is, they must be understood spiritually, and not literally; so saith St. Austin, *Believe, and thou hast eaten.*

It was Christ's manner to speak by Similitudes, Figures, and Parables, shewing one thing by another. For example, Christ calls the Lamb the Passover, in place whereof this Sacrament succeeded. And yet the Passover was this, *An Angel passed over the house of the Israelites, and struck the Egyptians*, Exodus 12. 27. This was not a Lamb, and yet because a Lamb was a sign of this Passover, as the Bread and Wine are of Christ's Body

Body and Blood ; because of that Christ called the Lamb the Passover, as he called the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood. This may be seen again in Circumcision, Baptism, and the Cup.

Circumcision is called the Covenant ; and yet Circumcision was nothing but the cutting away of a Skin, and the Covenant is this ; *In Abraham's seed all nations shall be blessed ; I will be their God, and they shall be my People ; I will defend and save them, and they shall serve and worship me.* This is not Circumcision, and yet as though the Circumcision were the Covenant it self, it is called the Covenant.

Likewise, Baptism is called Regeneration ; and yet Baptism is a *dipping our Bodies in Water*, and Regeneration is the renewing of our mind to the Image of God, wherein it was Created. This is not Baptism, and yet, as though Baptism were Regeneration it self, it is

24 Rome, *Tyrannous*,
is so called, because it signifies Re-
generation.

And the Cup is called the New Testament ; and yet the Cup is but a piece of Metal, filled with Wine : And the New Testament is, *He that believes in the Son of God shall be saved.* This is not a Cup, and yet, as though the Cup were the New Testament it self, it is called the New Testament. So the Bread and Wine are called Christ's Body and Blood, because they signify Christ's Body and Blood.

This Doctrine of ours may be confirmed, because every Sacrament was called by the thing which it signified ; and yet never any Sacrament was taken for the thing it self. What reason have they then to take this Sacrament for the thing it self more than all the rest ? It is the consent of all Divines, that a Sacrament is a Sign ; therefore it is no more the thing signified, than the

the Bush at the Door is the Wine in the Cellar.

But what then, will the Papists say, is there nothing in this Sacrament but Bread and Wine? We do not say that this Sacrament is nothing but a bare Sign, or that we receive no more than what we see: For Christ saith, *that it is his Body*; and St. Paul assures, that it is the Communion of Christ Body and Blood. Therefore there is more in this Sacramental Bread than in the common Bread we Eat in our Houses; for though the nature of Bread be not changed, yet the use is changed. It doth not only serve the Body, as it did before, but also it serves for the nourishing of our Souls; for as sure as we receive Bread, so sure we receive Christ. And you may see this by this Similitude: You have an Obligation in your hand, and I ask you, what have you there? and you answer, 'I have here an

D

hun-

Rome, Tyrannous,
hundred thousand Crowns. How I
say I, I see nothing but Paper, Ink,
and Wax ! Oh, but by this, say
you, I shall recover a hundred
thousand Crowns, and that is as
good.

So when ye receive these Signs
in the Sacrament of the Lord's
Supper, ye receive the Vertue of
Christ's Body and Blood by Faith;
and it is all one as if ye should eat
his Body, and drink his Blood in-
deed.

Secondly, I say that it is contrary
to Senses, that the Bread Con-
secrated by Popish Priests, be
really changed into Christ's Body.
For when the Church of *Rome*
would oblige me to believe, that
what my Senses behold, is not
Bread and Wine, but the true Bo-
dy and Blood of Christ, it is clear
that it is contrary to them; for my
Eyes see them to be Bread and
Wine, I smell nothing but Bread
and Wine, I taste nothing but
Bread

Bread and Wine, and my Hands feel nothing but Bread and Wine.

Object. We confess, say they, that it is contrary to Senses, but Senses ought not to be Judges in the Mysteries of Faith.

I Answer. That Jesus Christ made use of the Senses, to prove to his Apostles, that he was not a Spirit, but a Body, when he said unto them, *Handle me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have*, Luke 24. 32. And if the Fathers disputing against the *Marcionites* and *Euthicheens*, the former of which believed that Jesus Christ had not a true Body, but only the appearance; and the latter, that the Substance of his Body was changed into the Godhead after his Resurrection, they made use of the very words of Jesus Christ. *Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.* I may after their Example, make use of my Senses in

D 2

the

28 Rome, Tyrannous,

the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, and say, to let the Church of *Rome* know, that what they believe to be the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, is true Bread and Wine, *Handle and see.*

Object. The reason, say they, why Christ's Body is not seen in the Sacrament, is because he is there miraculously.

I Answer, That if the Bread be turned into the very Body of Christ by a Miracle, then should it appear visibly so. For the Nature of every Miracle is to be visibly to the outward Eyes and Senses. As when Jesus Christ turned Water into Wine, it was visibly Wine, when *Moses* Rod was turned into a Serpent, it was visibly a Serpent. And so if the Bread were turned into the very Body of Christ, it should be visibly a Body, if they will hold a Miracle in this Sacrament. But *St. Austin* answereth, that there is no Miracle in the

the Sacraments. *Honorem*, saith he, *tanquam Religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tanquam mira non possunt*, Tom. 1. 8. c. 12.

Thirdly, I say that this Doctrine is contrary to Reason. 1. Because it supposes the same *Body* in several places at one time. A *Body* may be considered objectively at one time in several places, but that it should be really or substantially in many places at one time altogether, as the Church of *Rome* would have, which teaches and obliges to believe that the *Body* of *Jesus Christ* is Substantially in *Heaven* and *Earth*, and in every place, where the *Priest* pleases to Consecrate, or pronounce these words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, and in every part of the Consecrated *Bread*; so that if you divide it into a thousand Parts no bigger than the Point of a Needle; he is there in every part wholly, that is contrary to Reason. For accor-

ding to Reason, a Body of six Foot in Dimension, cannot occupy no more place than the Circumference of six Foot; and though it may be successively in several places, yet it cannot at the same time.

And these words of St. Peter, Acts 3. 22. *Whom the Heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things*, Prove my saying evidently; for though he has a glorified Body, yet he retains the Nature and Property of a true Body still, which cannot be but in one place at once. And so saith St. Austin, in Joan. Tract. 3. *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit uno tantum loco esse potest.*

2. This Doctrine is contrary to Reason, because it makes Accidents exist without any Subject. It is the Nature of Accidents to be joyned to their Subject. As for Example, It is the nature of the whiteness of a Stone to be joyned to the Stone; so that if you destroy the Nature or Substance of this Stone,

Stone, you must of necessity destroy its Whiteness, and other its Accidents. And according to the Opinion of Modern Philosophers, who say that Accidents are nothing else than Matter modified, that is to say, as it is disposed to this or that Fashion; it follows that Matter cannot be destroyed without its Accidents being destroyed likewise with it. It is the Opinion of *Ireneus*, who saith, *That we cannot consider water without its Humidity, nor Fire without Heat, nor a Stone without Hardness; these things being so United, that the one cannot be without the other, but that they must exist together*. Nevertheless, those of the Church of *Rome* teach the contrary; for in their Mystery of *Transubstantiation*, they put Accidents without any Subject; they put Colour and Quantity without Matter, Smell and Taste without Substance, Hardness and Humidity without there being any thing that

that is hard and moist. I may then very well say and affirm, that this Doctrin is contrary to Reason.

Fourthly, I say that it is contrary to the Holy Fathers, for St. Chrysostome, Epist. ad Cæsar, saith, *That the mystical Symbols do not lose their proper Nature, but remain in their first Substance, as the Body of Christ has preserved the true Substance of a Body when it was Glorified.* And Writing to the People of Antioch, Hom. 6. he saith, *That God gives us things Spiritual under things Visible and Natural; and that Bread being Sanctified, is delivered from the Name of Bread, and is exalted to the Name of the Lord's Body, although the nature of the Bread still remains.*

Origines in Matth. 15. speaks thus, *The Bread that is Sanctified with the Word of God, as touching the material Substance thereof, goes into the Belly, and forth again like other Meats.*

Justin Martyr, and Irenæus Bishop of Lyon, say, That our Flesh is nourished with the Cup, which is the Blood of Christ, and is increased with the Bread, which is the Body of Christ. These words do destroy those of the Roman Church, who, because they believe that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, are forced to say, that our Body is not nourished with the Bread and Wine, but with their Accidents, or by some Substance that God Createth.

Tertullian, L. 4. Advers. Marci. c. 40. saith, that Jesus Christ took the Bread, and giving it to his Disciples, made it his Body, saying, this is my Body. That is to say, as Tertullian himself explains it, the Figure of my Body.

*St. Austin, Cont. Adam. c. 12. is of that Opinion, The Lord, saith he, doubted not to say, this is my Body, when he gave but the Signs of his Body. And in Psal. 8. He saith, That
the*

the admirable Patience of Christ admitted Judas to the Banquet, wherein he delivered to his Disciples the Figure of his Body and Blood. And in the third Book of the Christian Doctrine, he speaks thus. *when the Lord saith, if ye do not eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you shall have no life in you. He seems to command a wickedness and a great Crime; therefore it is a Figure, whereby it is enjoined unto us to think upon our Lord's Passion, and remember that his Flesh was Crucified and wounded for us. He saith also in an Epistle to Boniface, That the Sacraments are called by the name of the things they represent.*

The Sacrament then of the Lord's Supper, may be taken either conjunctively with what it represents, and in this Sense it is said to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; or separately from the things which it signifies, and in this Sense it

it is the Type, the Symbole, or Figure of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and that is to be seen in the Affairs of the World; as when we say, that the Letters which are brought, wherein is contained the Pardon which the King gives to a Criminal, are the King's Pardon.

Theodoret, *Dial. 2.* saith, *That the mystical Signs after Consecration do not depart from their Nature, but they abide still in their former Substance, Figure, and Form, and may be both seen and felt as before.* And, *Dial. 1.* he saith, *That Jesus Christ has honoured the visible Symbols with the Name of his Body and Blood, not in changing their Nature, but in adding Grace to it.*

The Pope *Gelasius*, in *lib. de duab. nat. advers. nest. & Eutich.* saith, *That the substance or nature of Bread doth not cease, and verily there is the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ celebrated in the*
action

action of the Mysteries of the Body of Christ.

Baronius, An. 648. N. 15. and 869. N. 3. saith, That *Theodorus*, Bishop of Rome, for the Condemnation of *Pyrrhus*; and that the Council held at *Constantinople* for the Condemnation of *Photius*, took the Consecrated Cup, and poured Ink into it, and having dipp'd their Pens into these two mixt Liquors, they subscribed the depositions of these Men. If they had believ'd that the Consecrated Wine was the Blood of Jesus Christ, as now the Church of Rome believes, is it credible that they would have mixt Ink with it, and dipp'd their Pens with it? No, it is not to be believed; for the Church of Rome would not do so now, but would believe they should commit an horrible Sacrilege.

Moreover, if the holy Fathers had believed *Transubstantiation*, that is, the conversion of Bread
and

and Wine into the true *Body* and *Blood* of *Jesus Christ*, they would not have failed to instruct us, that a *Body* is under a point; that it has *Accidents* without any *Subject*, and that it is after the manner of a *Spirit*. They would have taught us what nourishes our *Bodies* in receiving of this *Sacrament*, and from whence come the worms which are ingendred in the *Bread*. They would have told us what kind of action it is, which makes *Christ* Exist under the *Species* of *Bread* and *Wine*; whether it was a *Reproduction*, or *Adduction*, or *U-bification*. I say, they would have taught us all these things, since the *Church of Rome* gives now a particular instruction in it. Now, since they were as Learned as the present *Doctors* of the *Church of Rome* are at this time; and since they said nothing of it, it is a certain sign that this *Doctrin* was contrary to their *Opinion*.

And

And for the confirmation of what I say is, that when the Fathers disputed against Idolaters, they confuted them with these words, *why do you adore what your Hands have made, and which has neither Speech nor Motion, but is subject to Fire, and to Corruption, and to be stolen away by Thieves?* This was the Argument they made use of to prove that they were Idolaters. If at that time they had believed *Transubstantiation*, the Idolaters would not have failed to retort their Argument; and since we find they have not retorted it, it is a certain sign that this Doctrine was contrary to the holy Fathers.

The Origine of *Transubstantiation* was a Dream of *Paschasius*, a Monk of *Corbis*; and *Innocent* the Third, in the Year of our Lord 1215. set it up amongst the Articles of Faith, in the Council of *Latran*. So many years were past be-

before *Transubstantiation* was named. Then the Pope set it on foot, and so it came out from *Rome*; and for want of the holy Scripture, of Reason, and holy Fathers to maintain it, they have since defended, and do still defend it at this day with Sword and Fire.

It is then manifest, that the Bread Consecrated by the Popish Priests is not really changed into the *Body of Jesus Christ*; and therefore that the Church of *Rome* is Idolater; since in Worshipping a bit of Bread baked upon the Fire, in Praying to it, in carrying it in Procession, in shewing it to the People in their Mass, in offering Frankincense unto it, in bowing before it at the Ringing of a small Bell or Cymbal, as the People did before the Image of *Nebuchadnezzar*, and taking it for their God; She Worships the Creature for the Creator.

Object. We believe that what we do Worship is God, and that therefore hinders us from being Idolaters.

I Answer, If this Reason were good and sufficient, the Heathens, which did Worship *Jupiter*, had not been Idolaters; because they believed him to be the true God. And yet the Church of *Rome* maintains, that all those who did Worship *Jupiter*, were Idolaters. It is then true, that to Worship as a God, that which is not God, tho' it be taken for a God, is a gross and flat Idolatry; and therefore that the Church of *Rome* is Idolater, because she Worships for her God a bit of Bread, which is not God, although she believe, and take it for her God.

Reply, I say that she is Idolater, because she makes graven Images of the Godhead, and bows before them, and because she kneels down before those of Saints, prays to them,

them, kisses and serves them, offers Frankincense unto them, Crowns them with Flowers, Cloaths them with Fine Garments, and Orders, as it may be seen in the II. Council of *Nice*; that they shall not only be placed in Churches, Chappels, and Oratories, where the Divine Majesty is Worshipped, but shall be also Honoured and Worshipped.

Which is directly contrary to these words of *Samuel*, *Prepare your hearts to the Lord, and serve him only*; and to those of *Christ* in *St. Matthew*, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*; as also to those of *God*, in the XX Chapter of *Exodus*, *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, nor any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in Earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the Earth. Thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.*

Objection, This forbidding, say they, is against Idols, and not against Images; and when we bow to them and serve them, we do not render them a Worship of λατρεία, but of δαλεία only.

First, I Answer, That these words, *Nor any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, &c.* signifie the one and the other, I mean both Idols and Images. *Secondly*, I say, that besides this distinction of a Worship of λατρεία and δαλεία is new, and not found in the holy Scripture, the Roman Church, according to her own Confession, and the Doctrin of her Angelick Doctor *Thomas Aquinas*, Worships the Cross with a Worship of λατρεία. This Truth is especially seen upon *Good Friday*, at which time ye may see, that not only the Monks, Priests, Bishops, Cardinals, and the Pope himself bow and kneel down before it, and kiss it, all Singing, *Ecce lignum Crucis venite adoremus*;

adoremus ; but that all the common People imitate them also, and even that Princes and Kings lay down before it their Crowns and Scepters. They confess also that they do Worship the Images of God the Father with a Worship of *Latria*, and likewise those of the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Objection, This Worship, say they, that they do render to the Cross and Images of the Godhead and Saints, is Relative ; it is not related to the Cross and Images, but to God and Saints ; and that is the reason, say they, why they are not Idolaters.

I Answer, That these words of *Samuel*, *Prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only* ; and that these of *Jesus Christ* in *St. Matthew*, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, do quite destroy all these distinctions of the Church of *Rome* concerning the Relative Worship of *Latria* and *Dulia*.

Dulia. For, that it is a flat Idolatry to Worship God in any Image, I evidently shew it by the Children of *Israel*, when they made the golden Calf to be a Representation of God, *Exod. 32.* For the Text shews that it was a flat Idolatry, for which many of them were Plagu'd and Punish'd. And yet their Worship was Relative; for their meaning was to Worship the true God in the Calf; for they were not so simple as to think or believe that that dead Idol or Image was God. The Idolatry then of the Church of *Rome*, by Worshipping the Cross, and the Images of the Godhead, and by bowing down before the Images of Saints, Martyrs, Apostles, and kissing them, and imploring their assistance, and offering Frankincense unto them, is as gross and wicked as theirs was.

The Origine of the Worshipping images, proceeds from *Arise, Emperors*

prefs of *Constantinople*, about the year 790. She called a Council at *Nice*, wherein by Intreagues and Threatnings, she did so prevail, that it was concluded we ought to Worship Images, notwithstanding the Oppositions that were then made in all Parts. For the Emperor *Carolus Magnus*, did at the same time call a Council at *Frankfort*, wherein that of *Nice* was Condemn'd, and the Decree of Worshipping Images made void. But because they remained still in Churches, this Superstition of Worshipping them, to which the Ignorant People was always inclin'd, got at last the uppermost.

It is then true, as I have clearly made it appear, that the Church of *Rome* is *Idolater*.

Thirdly, I shew that she is *Heretick*; for all those that are obstinate in their Errors, are *Hereticks*.

The Church of *Rome* is obstinate in her Errors; therefore she is *Heretick*. The

The Major Proposition is true, and all Divines are of that Opinion. As for the Minor, which is in question, I prove it thus.

All those, that refuse to obey the Holy Scripture in several Points of Faith and Practice, are obstinate in their Errors.

The *Roman* Church refuses to obey the Holy Scripture in several Articles of Faith and Practice.

Therefore she is obstinate in her Errors.

The Major Proposition is true also, and it is the consent of all Divines. As for the Minor, behold as I prove it.

All those, that do add to the Holy Scripture, and diminish from it several Articles, both of Faith and Practice, refuse to obey the Holy Scripture; for *Deut.* 4. 2. It is commanded us neither to add to the Word of God, nor to diminish from it. And *St. Paul*, *1 Cor.* 4. 6. Forbids to think above that which is Written. But

But the Church of *Rome* adds to the Word of God, and diminishes from it several Articles both of Faith and Practice.

Therefore she refuses to obey the Word of God ; therefore she is obstinate in her Errors ; therefore she is *Heretick*.

That the Church of *Rome* does add to the Word of God, and diminish from it several Articles, both of Faith and Practice, is that I shall endeavour to shew evidently.

1. I say that she adds to the Word of God several Articles of Faith, which she obliges to believe under the Pain of Damnation. For though it be manifested in several places of the Holy Scripture, that Jesus Christ is our *Saviour, Redeemer and Mediator* ; that there is no *Salvation in any other*, and that there is no other name under Heaven, whereby we must be saved, *Acts 4. 12.* That we have an *Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the Righteous*, and that he is the *Propitiation* for

for our Sins, 1 John 2. 1. And that there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, Tim. 2. 5. Nevertheless those of the Church of Rome call the blessed Virgin the *She-Redeemer* of the World, as it may be seen in *Bellarmin. c. 4. of Indulgences.* And in the Litanies and Hymns Composed in her Honour, they call her the *Queen of Heaven, Mother of God, and their Hope,* and give her such Titles as belong to God only. They implore the help of Saints, they put their Trust and Confidence in them, and take them for their *Advocates and Mediators;* as we may see in several Prayers, wherein they speak thus. *O great Saint, in whom I put my Trust and Confidence, Pray for me miserable Sinner, &c.* And though Jesus Christ, Teaching his Disciples how they ought to Pray, bid them to call upon his Father, and say, *Our Father which art in Heaven.* And although the Almighty spake thus
by

by his Prophet, *Isaiah 45. 21. There is no God else beside me, a Just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me.* Yet those of the Church of *Rome* will have us to implore the help of Saints, to trust in them, and take them for our *Advocates* and *Mediators*; as it is declared in the Council of *Trent*. Sess. 25. It is then evident, that this Doctrine being not found in the Holy Scripture, they add to the Word of God, and think above that which is Written.

Object. We Pray, say they, and beg the Favour of the Saints, as we pray a Friend at Court to Request a Kindness from His Majesty; I Answer, they ought not to do so, for it is Written, *we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.* And we do not read that any other is our Advocate. If the King's Son should say, when ye will ask my Father any Favour,
F come

come ye unto me, and not unto another; if after this Declaration, some body should go unto another, he should be very Imprudent. Jesus Christ, *Matth. 11. 28.* Speaks thus, *Come unto me all ye that labour, and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest.* We must not have then another Advocate beside him. By him, saith *1. Paul*, we have an access to the Father, and we do not read that we have it also by the blessed Virgin, or by *St. Peter*, *St. Anthony*, or any other Saint.

St. Chrysostome, Hom. 2. de Cananea, speaking of this Woman, who, though she were a Sinner, was bold to come unto Christ, saith thus, *Behold the wisdom of this woman, she doth not Pray to James, she doth not beseech John, she goes not to Peter, she looks not to the company of the Apostles, neither request any of them; but for all this she takes Repentance for her Companion, and goes to the very Fountain it self.*

St.

St. Ambrose, in Rom. c. 1. speaks thus, They are wont to use a pitiful Excuse, saying, that by the Saints they may have access unto God, as by the Earls there is Access to Kings; by Officers and Earls, Access is made to the King, because the King himself is a Man; but to come to God, from whom nothing is hid, there is no need of a Spokesman, but a devout Mind; for wheresoever such a one speaks to him, he will answer him.

The Souls of Men, say Tertullian and St. Austin, do not take care of the Affairs of the Living: The Saints are not our Mediators, we do praise the Martyrs, because they fought for the Truth, but we do not worship them. For what end then are these Solemnities? That by them we may thank God for their Victories, and encourage others to imitate them, and be partakers of their Palms and Crowns. But, that we may obtain them, shall we implore the Assistance

52 *Rome, Tyrannous,*
of the Saints? No, but we shall im-
plore the help of that true God, who
made them Martyrs. de cura pro
mortuis, c. 13. & cont. Parm.
l. 2. c. 8. de Civit. l. 8. c. 27.

Hereunto I may add that which
is written in *Ecclesiastes 9. 5. That*
the dead knew not any thing, neither
have any more a portion for ever in
any thing that is done under the Sun.

Wherefore I may say that the
Church of *Rome* intreats in vain
the help of the Saints; for God a-
lone does know our Thoughts. And
the most Learned Doctors of that
Communion cannot say how they
may hear the Prayers of Men; for
they confess it is not a Property of
their Happines; and some say
they see only the things which be-
long to them; some say that God
discovers to them the Prayers of
Men; some say they see in the Face
of God, as in a Looking-glass, all
things here below. Some assure
that the Faithful which are upon
Earth,

Earth, give notice of their Desires and Minds to to the Saints, as the Angels do Communicate their Thoughts one with another. To make it short, the *Roman* Church is so uncertain concerning the Saints, that oftentimes she Worships and Prays to them, that are now burning in an everlasting Fire.

The Origine of the Intercession of the Saints, proceeds from those publick Penitents; which for their Crimes, were Condemned to be separated from the Church for some years. For Martyrdom being in a great Honour amongst Christians, and the Church having a particular esteem for those that were Prisoners for the Gospel, the publick Penitents did Write to these Martyrs, that they would be so kind as to Intercede for them towards the Church, that they might be admitted in her Communion, before the time of their

Penance were expired. Such was the Intercession of Saints at that time, they knew then no other in the second Age, as it may be seen in *St. Cyprian*.

Secondly, I say that the Church of *Rome* adds to the Word of God, when she teaches, and will have us to believe that there is a Purgatory, wherein the Souls of the Faithful departing this Life are Afflicted and Tormented; some for a short time, some for a hundred years, some for a thousand and upwards, and others to the end of the World. For this Doctrine is not found in the Holy Scripture, but it is quite contrary to it; as it appears by these Words of the 14th Chapter of the *Revelations*, *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.* As also by those of the *Book of wisdom*, Canonized by the gene-

general Council of *Trent*, wherein it is written, that *the Souls of the Righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them.* This appears also by *St. Paul*, when he saith in his Epistle to the *Romans*, that *there is now no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.*

Nevertheless *Pope Pius* the Fourth finding Purgatory very advantageous to his Kirchin, speaks thus, *I certainly believe that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls detained therein are relieved by the Prayers of the Faithful.* And the Council of *Trent*, Sess. 25. gives Order to all Bishops, to take care that the sound Doctrine of Purgatory, which was delivered to us by the holy Fathers and sacred Councils be Believed, and Taught, and Preached every where. And though *Mr. Amelot*, who was a Papist, and translated into French the History of the Council of *Trent*, does confess that Purgatory cannot

not be prov'd; and though the Church of *Rome* cannot declare, whether this Purgatory be in the Air, or in the Earth, or in the place wherein Sins are committed; yet she saith, that the Pope with an Indulgence laid unto a Bead, or Cross, or Medal; or with a Mass Celebrated upon certain days of the Week, gives Power to deliver from this Purgatory whom he pleases, and when he thinks it fit.

I say then in the first place, since this Doctrine is not found in the holy Scripture, the *Roman* Church addeth to the Word of God, and thinks above that which is written. 2ly, I shew she does destroy her self, when she will have us to believe under the Pain of Damnation, that there is a Purgatory. For, if there be a Purgatory, either it is to purge Sins, or to purge the Pain due unto them. It is not for the former, because the *Roman* Church believes, that Jesus Christ did by himself
purge

purge all our sins, according to these words of St. *John*, *His Blood cleanses us from all sins*; and because they are to be purged before we be separated from this World, it is then for the purgation of the Pain; but the Pain is punished and not purged; for a Gallows is not for the purgation of a Murder, but for the punishment of it. Therefore, since Purgatory, according to the Papists, is only for the Pain due to sins, they destroy themselves when they call it Purgatory. It has no warrant in the holy Scripture, for Jesus Christ shews but two places, *Heaven* and *Hell*, when he saith, that the *Rich Man's* Soul, which was unmerciful to *Lazarus*, went after his Death into *Hell*, and there was tormented; and that *Lazarus's* Soul, he being Dead, was carried into *Abraham's Bosome*, a place of Joy and Comfort. To the *Thief* which was Executed with Christ at his Passion, and be-

believed in him, Jesus Christ answered, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*: Which shews that the Souls of the Faithful never come into Purgatory-fire, to be burnt and tormented; for all their Sins are forgiven, and consequently the Punishment incident to the same is forgiven also; and their Souls pass from Death to Life, that is, they go to Heaven. *Blessed are the dead that dye in the Lord, from henceforth they rest from their labors, and their works follow them.* If from the time of their Death they have Blessedness, and Rest, then they are not in any Purgatory-fire to be burnt and tormented. *The first place, saith St. Austin, Hyp. L. 5. the Faith of the Catholicks, doth by divine Authority believe, is the Kingdom of Heaven; the second is Hell; a third place we are utterly ignorant of, neither can we find such a one in the holy Scriptures.* And in his Enchiridion ad Laur. c. 67. He saith,
That

That those that believe a Purgatory-fire, are much deceived, and that through a humane Conceit. Know ye, saith he, de van. secul. 1. c. That when the Soul is separated from its Body, she is immediately placed in Paradise for her good Works, or cast into Hell because of her Sins.

Object. The Primitive Church, say they, did pray for the Dead, as *Tertullian de Corona Militis* doth confess: Therefore it is a good proof that she believed a Purgatory.

I Answer, That when the Primitive Church did pray for the Dead, she did not believe they were in any place of Torments, nor that there was a Purgatory: She only believed, that the Souls of the Faithful should only enjoy the sight of God after the day of Resurrection. She prayed then for the filling up of their Glory; she prayed to be joyned with them, and be partakers of the Resurrection of the Faith-

Faithful She prayed that Jesus Christ would hasten their Resurrection; and she prayed also for the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the Apostles and Martyrs, that God would be pleased to increase their Glory; but she did not implore their assistance, nor believe a Purgatory, as it is related by *Justin Martyr*, 9. 60. and 76. *Iren. L. 5. Tertul. Cont. Marc. L. 4. c. 13.*

The Origine of Purgatory is *Virgil* in the sixth Book of his *Eneids*, wherein he saith, that the Souls, before they enjoy Blessedness, are differently purged in different places, as you may see in these following Verses.

Erga exercentur pænis, veterumque malorum

Supplicia expendunt; alia panduntur inanes

Suspense ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto

Infectum eluitur Sæclis, aut exurit igni, &c.

Third-

Thirdly, I shew that the Church of *Rome* adds to the Word of God, when she teaches, that the general Councils and Popes are Infallible; that the latter have Authority or Pre-eminence over all other Bishops; that they have power to Depose Kings and Princes from their Thrones, and are above them; for this Doctrine is not found in the holy Scriptures.

1. I say that their general Councils and Popes are not Infallible; for *St. Austin*, Tom. 6. l. 2. cont. Donat. plainly teaches that God alone and the holy Scriptures are Infallible or cannot Err. *The general Councils*, saith he, *which are gathered of all the Christian world, are often corrected, the former by the latter, when by any tryal of things, that is opened which was shut, and that is known which was hidden.* If a general Council may be corrected, as saith *St. Austin*, therefore it may err; Wherefore he speaks thus to *Maxi-*

82 Rome, Tyrannous,

mian Bishop of the *Arians*; Neither ought I to alledge the Council of Nice, nor thou the Council of Arimini to take advantage thereby; for neither am I bound nor held by the Authority of this, nor thou of that. Set Matter with Matter, Cause with Cause, or Reason with Reason; try the Matter by the Authority of the Scriptures, l. 3. c. 4.

The Council of Constantinople condemned the setting up Images in the Churches; and the Council of Nice, Act. 4. ordered afterwards they should be set up. One of these Councils, being contrary to the other, must needs be Erroneous. And that is granted by it self, when in a set Form of Prayer, which is appointed to be said after the conclusion of every Council, they pray, *that God would spare their Ignorance and pardon their Errors.* de ord. celeb. conc.

The Pope himself may Err; for Pope *Innocentius* doth teach, lib. ad

Bo-

Bonif. cont. Epist. Pelag. c. 4. *That young Children cannot be saved, except they receive the Baptism of Christ, and also the Communion of his Body and Blood.* And Pope Gelasius, *Comperimus Consecra. de distinct. 2. did decree, That all they should be Excommunicated, which would receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper but in one kind.* But this Doctrine is now taxed for an Error by all Papists; and the Council of Trent, Sess. 21. Can 1. made a Decree contrary to the Doctrine of the Pope Gelasius. *If any body, saith this Council, assures that all and every Faithful are obliged by God's Commandment to receive one and the other species in the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, let him be Anathema.* Therefore it is evident that the Popes may Err: And this may be seen in their own Decrees, wherein it is written, *That they are to be judged of none, except they be found erring from the*

Faith, part. 1. cap. dist. 40. cap. si
 Papa. Whereby it appears that
 they thought their Popes might Err
 in matter of Faith, or else that ex-
 ception was put in vain. For all
 Men are subject to Error; all Men
 are worse in their Words, and Sin-
 ners in their Works. There is
 none True and Infallible but God,
 and his holy Scriptures, because
 they are inspired of him. *He is the
 God of Truth, he cannot Lie, Tit.*
 1. 2.

2. I say that the Popes have no
 Authority or Pre-eminence over
 the other Bishops, though those
 of the Church of *Rome* stily
 holding the contrary, give them
 the Title of *Universal Bishops*, and
 call them *Gods on Earth, Kings of
 Kings, and Lords of Lords*, as saith
Albanus, de potest. pap. part. 1. n.
 22. And *Antonins*, part. 3. n. 22.
 And upon the Triumphant Arch,
 Erected in the honour of *Sixte* the
 Fourth it was written,

Oratio

*Oratio vocis Mundi moderaris h.
benas*

*Et merito in Terris diceris esse
Deus.*

But this Doctrine being not found in the holy Scriptures, it is consequently manifest they do add to the Word of God.

Objection, The Popes, say they, have Authority or Pre-eminence over all other Bishops, because they are Successors to St. *Peter*; and St. *Peter* had such a Pre-eminence and Authority over the rest of the Apostles; because Jesus Christ told him, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.*

I grant that Christ said to *Peter*, after he had confessed him to be that Christ, and the Son of the Living God, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* But these words give no Superiority to St. *Peter* above the other Apostles; only they shew, that the Church is builded, not upon the Person of

Peter, but upon the Rock, namely upon Christ, whom *St. Peter* confesses to be the Son of the Living God. For, as saith *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. 3. 11. *That Rock was Christ, and other foundation can no man lay but that which is laid already, namely, Jesus Christ.* And in the second Chapter to the *Ephesians*, he saith, *That the Church is built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the head stone in the corner.* Where then can they find that *St. Peter* was made Prince of the Apostles, and had Pre-eminence or Authority over them? They say it is, when Jesus Christ gave unto *Peter* the Keys of Binding and Loosing.

I answer, that Christ therein gave no more Authority to *St. Peter* than to the rest of the Apostles; for he doth not say, I give unto Thee, but I will give unto Thee; which Promise was afterwards perform'd; and when it was perform'd,

form'd, the Keys, or the Power of Binding and Loosing was given not only to St. Peter, but also unto all the rest together, *Go ye, saith Jesus Christ, Matth. 28. 19. unto all nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* And in the twentieth Chapter of St. John, he speaks thus, *Receive ye the holy Ghost, whatsoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whatsoever sins ye retain, they are retained.* By these words ye may clearly see, that Jesus Christ speaks unto all the Apostles, and not to Peter only. And so it is evident that St. Peter receives no more Power than the rest of the Apostles.

I grant that St. Peter may be called the first of the Apostles in the way of reckoning; or as it is commonly seen amongst Men, who though they be equal, do notwithstanding

standing determine one amongst themselves, to whom, without being greater than the others, leave is given to speak first. St. *Matthew* 10. 2. did mean nothing else, when he said, *Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these, the first Simon, who is called Peter.* He doth not distinguish him from the others but by the order of counting. If he be then the first of the Apostles, it is only by the way of reckoning: For the scripture tells us, *Ephes.* 2. 20. That the Church is no less builded upon the others than upon him; when she saith that the Faithful are builded upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and that there is no other Foundation, nor other Head-stone to prop the Church but Jesus Christ, on whom the whole Edification is laid. He is the chief and principal Foundation, all the others are only subalterne and dependent. It is then impos-
sible

Idolater, and Heretick.

fible that *St. Peter* be the Foundation of the Church more than are the other Apostles, and consequently have more Authority. For, as I have already made it appear, *Jesus Christ* spake to all his Disciples gathered together, when he said, *Matth. 18. 18. whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* He sends them all as his Father had sent him: He equally makes them his Ambassadors, and gives no more Power or Authority to one than to the other.

Where was *Peter's* Supremacy or Authority, when *St. Paul*, *Gal. 2. 11. withstood him to the Face, because he was to be blamed?* And where was *Peter's* Pre-eminence, when in the Council held at *Hierusalem*, where the Apostles were present, *St. James*, and not *St. Peter* did Rule in the Action? And when there was a dispute among the
the

70 Rome, Tyrannous,

the Apostles, which of them should be accounted the greatest, Luke 22. 25. Jesus Christ said unto them, *The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called Benefactors; but ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.* If the greatest ought to be as the younger, and he that is chief as he that doth serve, what Authority has he over the rest? Since then the Pope's Authority over the other Bishops is grounded by the Church of Rome upon St. Peter's Authority over the other Apostles; and since St. Peter has no such Authority over them, it follows that the Popes have none over the other Bishops.

This is confirmed by the Popes themselves: For John Bishop of Constantinople aiming to be the first, and have the Title of Universal

sal Bishop, *Gregorius* Bishop of *Rome* withstood him, and in his 54th. Epistle to the Empress speaks thus of him. *By this Pride and Vanity, what is foretold but that the time of Antichrist is at hand, and art like Lucifer, who making no account of that Happiness he had in common with the whole Army of Angels, aspired to a singularity over all the others, saying, as it is written in Isaiah, I will raise my Throne above the stars of Heaven.* And in 28 Epistle he affirms, *That whosoever takes the Title of Universal Bishop to himself, he cannot be less than Antichrist.* And *St. Hierome* ad *Evag.* saith, *That the Bishop of Eugubium, or any other the least See, is equal to the Bishop of Rome.* For they are all joyned in the same Commission; they must serve in the Church, and be diligent to discharge that great Charge, which their Master *Jesus Christ* has equally laid upon them.

3. I say that the Popes have no Power to Depose Kings and Princes from their Thrones, and are not above them. For the pulling down of Princes God has reserved to himself alone that Power; for it is *he that putteth down the Mighty from their Seats, and Exalteth them of low Degree.* By me, saith he, *the Kings Reign, and Princes bear Dominion.* He removes Kings, and setteth up Kings, wherefore, since it is God that has this Authority proper to himself, which way can the Popes claim it, without Injury to the Power of God, and to that of Kings, whereunto they ought to be submitted.

They say, it is by reason of their Keys, as it appears in the Bull of Excommunication, which the Pope *Sixte* the fifth thundered in the year 1585, against *Henry* King of *Navarre*, and the Prince of *Conde*, wherein he saith, *That the Authority given to St. Peter and his*

Suc-

cessors, by the infinite Power of God, is above all Powers upon Earth, that it belongs to that Authority to cause the Laws to be observ'd, and punish the Offenders, by pulling them down from their Seats, how Powerful soever they be.

This is the Origine and the Ground of the *Popes* Authority over all Men, and of Deposing Kings and Princes from their Thrones. But they are deceived; for they ought to remember, that the Keys given, were the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and consequently by this Authority of the Keys, he cannot meddle with Terrestrial Kingdoms, to shut out those that are in them. And they ought also to remember, that he has no more Authority by the Power of his Keys, or of Binding and Loosing, than any other Bishop; for the Keys were given to all the rest of the Apostles, as well as to St. *Peter*. For Christ speaks thus, Re-

ceive ye the Holy Ghost, whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained. It is then manifeſt, that it is contrary to the Will of Jeſus Chriſt, that any Miniſter of the Goſpel ſhould claim Authority above another; for they are all indifferently joyned in one Commiſſion, and conſequently have all equal Authority. And therefore the Pope has no more Authority by the Vertue of his Keys than any other Biſhop, that is to ſay, none at all to Depoſe Kings and Princes from their Thrones. His Duty is rather to obey them, and teach the ſame Obedience to others, as the Apoſtles of Chriſt did. For in the firſt Epiſtle of St. Peter, 2. 13. It is Written thus, *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Men for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King, as Supreme.* And St. Paul to the Romans, 3. 1. ſaith; *Let every Soul be Subject to the higher Powers.* And
Jeſus

Jesus Christ himself said, that *his Kingdom was not of this world*. He refused to be made a King, he payed Tribute to *Cesar*, and commanded others to do the same. If then Christ were Subject to *Cesar*, is it not a great shame to the *Pope* to exalt himself above *Cesar*, I mean above Kings.

Some Papists do Answer, that he got this Sovereign Authority by Donation from the Emperor *Constantine*; but let it be granted, that some Christian Emperor was so foolish, as to give his Empire, (which is neither likely nor credible) yet I say it was not Lawful for him to take it, if he will be a true Minister of the Gospel, or lawful Successor of the Apostles. For Christ has expressly forbidden his Apostles, and in them all the Ministers of the Gospel, all such Dominions, when he told them, *Matth. 20. 26. Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise Do-*

minion over them, but it shall not be so among you. Which words being prohibitory, shew that they must not Reign like Kings of Nations, but must serve in the Church, and be diligent in the great Charge that Jesus Christ has laid upon them.

It is then evident by what I have said here before, that the Pope has no Authority over Kings and Princes, and is not above them. This may be seen by these Words of *Tertullian*, in *Apolog.* *We Honour*, saith he, *the Emperor as the next Man to God, and Inferior to God only.* And in another place, he saith, that *the King is the second to God, the first next after God, and before and over all Men.*

Optatus Cont. Parmen. l. 13. saith, that *there is none above the Emperor but God only, which made the Emperor.* And *St. Chrysostome*, ad *Pop. Anthio.* hom. 2. saith, *He has no equal on Earth.* And *Gregory*
Bi

Bishop of Rome, himself affirms, that Power is given to Princes from Heaven, not only over Souldiers, but Priests also. Which is confirmed by St. Peter, when he saith in his first Epistle 2. 13. *Submit your selves to every Ordinance, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King, as Supream.*

It is then evident, that the Popes are not Infallible, that they have no Authority to Depose Kings and Princes from their Thrones, and that they are not above them. And therefore that the Church of Rome does add to the Word of God, when she holds and teaches such a Doctrine.

Secondly, I say, and shall endeavour to make it appear, that the Roman Church diminishes from the Word of God, several Points of Faith and Practice. 1. Because she Prays, Sings, and gives Thanks to God in the Church in an unknown Tongue. 2. Because she forbids

78 Rome, Tyrannous,

the Reading of the Holy Scriptures to the common People. 3. Because in the Lord's Supper, she takes away the Cup from them and from the Clerks that are not Priests. 4. Because she forbids every one to eat Flesh in certain Time and Days, and all Priests, Monks and Nuns to Marry..

I. I say that the *Roman Church* diminishes from the Word of God, when she Prays, Sings, and gives thanks to God in the Church in a Tongue unknown to the common People. For *St. Paul* will not only have us to speak in the Church with a known Tongue, but also he shews the Confusion of them that speak in an unknown Tongue. Except Pipe or Harp, saith he, *1 Cor. 14.* give distinction in the sound, how shall it be known what is Piped or Harped? If the Trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the Battle? So likewise you, except ye utter by the Tongue, words easie to be

be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye shall speak into the Air. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the Voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a Barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me.

Object. St. Paul saith, the Church of Rome thereby speaketh concerning Sermons, and consequently doth not speak against her, because she Preaches in a known Tongue. I answer, that St. Paul speaks concerning Prayers, Psalms and Thanksgivings. If I Pray, saith he, in an unknown Tongue, my Spirit Prayeth, but my Understanding is Unfruitful. what is it then? I will Pray with the Spirit, and I will Pray with the Understanding also; I will Sing with the Spirit, and I will Sing with the Understanding also; else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he, that occupyeth the Room of the Unlearned, say Amen at thy giving

80 Rome, Tyrannous,
ving of Thanks, seeing he under-
stands not what thou sayest.

And notwithstanding this Or-
dinance of St. Paul, and the Con-
fusion of them which go against it;
as it is declared by the Compari-
sons of the Pipe, Harp, and Trum-
pet, the Roman Church Prays, Sings,
and gives Thanks in the Church
in a Tongue unknown to the
common People. And though
in the Primitive Church, all Pray-
ers were made in the vulgar
Tongue. *Lingua auditoribus non
ignota omnia peragebantur, & con-
suetudo ita ferebat, ut tota Ecclesia si-
mul psalleret.* And though St. Au-
stin says, *Deus vult ut quod Cani-
mus intelligamus & humana ratione
non quasi Avium voce canamus.* God
will have us to understand what
we Sing, and not be like Parrots,
which do not understand what
they say. Yet the Church of Rome
doth not obey this Command-
ment,

Idolatrous, and Heretick. 81
ment, but continue still in that Error.

The Origine of this Error proceeds from the Popes of *Rome*, who being exalted in an eminent degree of Grandeur, could not be contented until they had set up Laws, though very irregular and unreasonable; and as it is usual amongst Conquerors, had introduced and impos'd their own Language upon those they had subdued and made their Slaves. So they have to the uttermost of their Power established their Liturgies, Ceremonies and Language in all Churches, that they might serve afterwards as a Monument of their Jurisdiction and Authority upon others.

2. I say that the *Roman Church* doth diminish from the Word of God, when she forbids the Reading of the Holy Scriptures to the common People. For this forbidding of hers is wholly contrary to the Commandment of Jesus Christ, who

who in the 5th Chapter of St. John 39 Verse, speaks thus, *Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testifie of me.* And quite contrary to this Ordinance of St. Paul; who writing both to the Bishops and all his Brethren, either Men or Women, either young or old, speaks thus in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all holy Brethren.* And writing to the Colossians, 4. 16. he saith, *when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.*

However, as if the Church of Rome were wiser than Jesus Christ, St. John, St. Paul, and all other Apostles and holy Fathers, who did so much, and so often recommend it, she forbids it to the common People, stily affirming that it is dan-

dangerous, that it causes Schisms, several Sects and Heresies. For in the Council of Trent it is written, *that if the Reading of the Holy Scripture be permitted in a known Tongue amongst all People, it will be more hurtful than profitable.*

The abuse some make of the Holy Scripture, ought not generally to condemn the use of it; otherwise the best things would be taken away from us, because they are sometimes misused. The use of Wine would be forbidden; because many are Drunk with it, and is the cause of several Disorders. It is enough to forbid what is essentially bad, without forbidding that which is essentially good. Jesus Christ doth not only permit the Reading of the Holy Scripture to some particular Jews, but he enjoins it unto all. *search, saith he, the Scriptures.* And that he may the better induce them, he makes them remember, *That in them they think*

84 Rome, *Tyrannous,*

think they have eternal Life. He seems in another place to attribute all their Errors to the Ignorance of that Sacred Book, when he said to the *Saducees*, Matth. 22. 29. *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.* Had not the *Eunuch* read the Prophet *Isaiah*, he should never have understood him. And it was by this Reading he began to be a Christian; as it maybe seen in the *Acts*, 8. 30.

The People of *Berea*, as it appears in the 17th Chapter of the *Acts*, were highly commended that they searched the Scriptures, to see whether those things were true or no, which *Paul* did Teach. For whosoever he be, though he were an Angel from Heaven, if he Teach Matters contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, we are to hold him accursed; as saith St. *Paul*, Gal. 1. 8. *All Scripture*, saith the same Apostle, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable*

fitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

Nevertheless the Church of Rome doth forbid to the common People so good a Book, so useful to Piety, and so necessary to Salvation. Is it not then a great Cruelty to forbid Children to see and read the Testament of their Fathers! Is it not an excess of rigour to deprive them of that which nourishes their Souls for an *Eternal Life*? And is it not an extreme Tyranny to hinder them from seeing that, which they are to be judged upon?

3. I say that the Church of *Rome* diminishes from the Word of God, when in the Lord's Supper she takes away the Cup from the common People, and from the Clerks that are not Priests. For we read in *St. Matthew 26. 27.* that in the

Institution of this Sacrament, *Jesus Christ took the Cup, and gave it all his Disciples, saying, drink ye all of it.*

Objection, When Jesus Christ said to his Disciples, *Drink ye all of it,* He spake to the Priests only, saith the *Roman Church*, and therefore the Priests only ought to drink of the Cup.

I Answer, that *St. Paul* writing to the *Corinthians*, amongst whom were more *Laics* than *Priests*, doth evidently shew the contrary; for, speaking to every one, he saith, *1 Cor. 11. 28. Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.* *St. Ignatius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, and Disciple of the Apostles, in the 69th. Year of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Epist. 9. ad Philadelph.* saith, *That one and the same Bread was broken to all, and one and the same Cup distributed to all.* *Justin Martyr* tells us, *That the consecrated Bread and Wine were,*
in

Idolatrours, and Heretick. 87

in his time, distributed to every Communicant. And St. Chrysostome, Hom. 18. upon the second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians speaks thus, There is a time, where there is no difference between Priests and those that preside over, as when we receive the holy Mysteries; for we are all equally admitted to them. It is not now as it was under the Old Testament, where the Priest did eat particular things, and the People others; where it was not lawful to the People to eat that which the High Priest was then eating. It is not so now, for one and the same Body, and one and the same Cup is given to all.

The Pope Gelasius, in the Year 490. 2. Distinct. 2. Can. Comperimus, did Decree, that all they should be Excommunicated, which would receive the Lord's Supper but in one kind; and his Predecessor Leo did call those Sacrilegious, that did refuse to take the Cup.

And

And tho' in the general Council of *Constance*, Sess. 13. the *Roman Church* do confess this holy Sacrament was receiv'd in the Primitive Church with the Bread and the Cup; yet in the general Council of *Trent* she speaks thus, *If any man say that the Catholick Church had not just Reasons to give the Communion to the Laics, and Clerks who did not say Mass, under the accidents of Bread only, and that she Erred in this, let him be Anathema.*

The Reasons, saith the *Roman Church*, why they took the Cup from them, are many Inconveniencies and several Absurdities.

I Answer, that besides there is no Inconveniency, though there should be any, it ought not to be above the Commandment of Jesus Christ and St. *Paul*. Christ, the Primitive Church, and the Apostles were very Wise; and Wiser than shall ever be the Church of *Rome*; and since they have commanded

manded and given the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper with the Cup, the *Roman* Church ought to follow their example and obey them. The Inconveniencies, which they suppose at this day, as that the Flies may fall into the Cup, or that the Communicant's Beard may touch the Blood, were in the time of Jesus Christ and his Apostles: Had there been any Inconveniency, Jesus Christ and his Apostles should have certainly remedy'd it. Therefore since they have not forbidden the Cup to the common People, who did then receive the Communion, the Church of *Rome* ought not now to forbid it.

The Origine of taking the Cup from the common People proceeds from *Transubstantiation*; which being believed produces *Concomitancy*; and from this *Concomitancy* followed this conclusion, that the *Laics* ought to be contented with the consecrated Bread, because the
Blood

90 *Rome, Tyrannous,*

Blood of Christ was therein contained as well as in the Cup.

But I have already prov'd, that there is no Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: And though there were any, the *Roman* Church ought not to take away the Cup from the People; because Jesus Christ, his Apostles, and the Primitive Church did not take it from them; and because *St. Paul* orders every one to take it, when he saith, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.*

4. I say that the *Roman* Church diminishes from the Word of God, when she forbids every one to Eat Flesh in certain times and days; and all Priests, Monks and Nuns to Marry: For *St. Paul*, writing to the *Colossians* 2. 16. speaks thus, *Let no man judge you in meat and drink.* And in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians* 10. 28. &c. *whatsoever,*

soever, saith he, is sold in the Shambles, that eat, asking no question for Conscience sake. If any of them, that believe not, bid you to a Feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, eat. And writing to Timothy, he saith, That every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving.

And concerning Marriage, 1 Cor. 9. 6. he speaks thus, Have we not power to lead about a sister a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of the Lord and Cephas? And in the 1 to Timothy 3. 2. he saith, That a Bishop can be the husband of one wife. And in the 13 to the Hebrews, that Marriage is honourable to all, and the bed undefiled, but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. And in the 1 to Timothy 4. 3. he tells us, that forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats is a doctrine of Devils. And Jesus Christ himself ho-

honoured so much the Marriage of the Priests, that he did chuse the Son of the High Priest *Zacharias* to be his Fore-runner. To avoid Fornication, saith *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. 7.2. *Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.*

And notwithstanding all these Texts of the holy Scripture, the *Roman Church* commands, under the pain of Sin unto Death, and consequently of Damnation, to abstain from Flesh in certain times and days; and forbids all Bishops, Priests and Clerks to marry. And though in the Council of *Nice*, of which the Ecclesiastical Historian speaks thus, *It pleased some Bishops to introduce a new Law in the Church; that those, who were dedicated to holy Ministry, namely the Bishops, Priests, Elders and Deacons, should lie no more with their wives. But Paphnutius an Egyptian Bishop, and who had one of his Eyes plucked out for the*

the Confession of Jesus Christ, rose up, and opposed them, saying, That they ought not to impose so heavy a Yoke; because Marriage was honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled; and that this Prohibition would be hurtful to the Church, because all men had not the Gift of Continence; which did so much prevail, that the Council consented to his opinion, Hist. tripart. l. 2. c. 14. Yet Gregory the VIIth. with cruel Decrees of Excommunication, deprived Ministers of their Wives, and forced the Clergy to the Vow of Continence. And the Council of Trent, Sess. 23. Can. 11. forbids Marriage to all Clerks that are in Orders, and to all Regulars or Monks that have made a solemn Vow of Chastity; and thundereth Anathema against those that say they may marry, notwithstanding they feel they have not the Gift of Chastity. And so this Council doth not only oppose the Primitive Church, and the Apostles, but even the Law, which

which God himself has pronounced. For when he said, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*, thou shalt not be a Whoremonger; it is as if he should say, Thou shalt make use of Marriage, which is a proper means to avoid these two great Sins. It is an implicit Commandment of God made to all Men and Women that have not the Gift of Continence, in what state and condition soever they be.

Objection, The Monks and Nuns have made a solemn Vow of perpetual Chastity; therefore they cannot marry.

I Answer that they cannot, and ought not to make such a Vow. For every Vow, to be good, according to the very Principles of the Church of *Rome*, ought to have two Conditions: It ought to be of a good thing, and ought to be in our Power. When the *Jews* made a Vow, that they would neither Eat nor Drink, till they had kill'd

Paul;

Paul; that Vow was void, and they were not obliged by it: For, had it been in their Power, yet it was of a bad thing. And when *Jacob* did Vow unto God, if he could return in peace into his Father's House, the Lord should be his God, and would offer unto him the Tenth part of his Goods, *Gen.* 28. 20. That Vow was good, because it contained the two required Conditions for a good Vow. It was of a good thing, and in his Power. When Monks and Nuns, at sixteen years old, Vow unto God Almighty to keep a perpetual Chastity, that Vow doth not bind them, because it is made of a thing which is not in their Power: For Continence is a Gift of God. He doth not grant it to every body, but to whom he pleases, *Matth.* 19. 11. Therefore those only, that are indued with it, are bound to keep it. Therefore when he, that has Vowed a perpetual Chastity, finds

by experience, he is often troubl'd with the Lusts of the Flesh; and, though he has several times called upon God, they still continue to torment him, it is a certain sign that God has not granted him the Gift of Continence; and therefore will have him to make use of Marriage, which is honourable amongst all, and which he has appointed as a means to keep Mankind, and as a remedy to pacifie our inordinate Passions. For, when he made Man, he speaks thus, *It is not good for a man to be alone, I will give him a companion*, Gen. 2. 18. *He made them male and female; and for this cause, he said, that man shall forsake Father and Mother, and cleave to his wife*, Matth. 19. And St. Paul saith, *That, to avoid fornication every man ought to have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, for it is better to marry than burn*, 1 Cor. 7. Formerly young Women were not admitted to take
the

the Nun's Vail, till they were forty years old, as it may be seen, *Can. Sanctimoniales causa. 20. 9. 1.* And though St. Paul speaks thus, *I will that younger women marry, bear children, guide the house: Let not a widow be taken in the number under threescore years old; but the younger widows refuse, for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, 1 Tim 5.* Yet those of the Church of Rome laugh now at this Ordinance and Custome: For they shut up young Maids in Monastries, before they have any true knowledge of God, of the World, and of Themselves. So *Rhea Sylvia Numitor's* Daughter was shut up in the Monastery of *Vesta* by her Uncle *Amulius*, who had expelled *Numitor* for fear she should marry, and get Children able to revenge and re-obtain her Father's Estate. They are shut up in Iron Cages, as wild Beasts, and mad Folke, for fear they should

commit any disorder. By this Prison, wherein they are shut up, and by this Prohibition of Gregory, That all Priests and Clerks ought not to converse, nor dwell with women, nor so much as with their Mothers, Sisters, and Kindred, lest it should happen to them, as it happened to the Son of David. It is clear that neither the one nor the other have the Gift of Continence, for if they were endued with it, for what end all these Iron Cages to the Nuns, and all those strict Prohibitions to the Priests? And if they have not the Gift of Continence, St. Paul commands them to marry, and consequently they are not bound to keep their Vows. Therefore all Priests, Monks and Nuns, are obliged to them but upon this condition, that God has endued them with the Gift of Continence. As he, that made a Vow to be a great Philosopher, or famous Orator, is not bound to the perfor-

mance of that Vow but upon condition, that God gives him a sufficient Wit and Strength for the obtaining of these two eminent Qualities. I have the Gift of Continence, therefore I make a Vow to keep a perpetual Chastity, that Consequence is good. But I promise unto God a perpetual Chastity, therefore he shall give me the Gift of Continence, this Consequence is not good. For in the Contracts we make with Men, our Promise doth not oblige us, but as it is accepted by him, to whom we make it. And when a young Man and Maid at sixteen years old, solemnly promise unto God a perpetual Chastity, who told them that God did accept their Promise?

Therefore, since many Monks, Nuns, and Priests, have neither the Gift of Continence, nor any assurance that they shall have it all the Days of their Lives; it is a Rashness to them to promise what is

100 Rome, Tyrannous,

not in their Power. Therefore their Vow wanting the last Condition to make it good, becomes void; therefore they may, and ought to Marry. *For it is better to Marry than to Burn; and Marriage is Honourable in all, but the whoremongers and Adulterers God will Judge.*

The Origine of Monastical Life, came from several Christians, who in the time of Persecution retired into desert Places. And when Persecution ceased, many of them rested there, either because they were used to that Calm, Innocent, and retired way of Life; or because they were afraid to fall again into Persecution. But this Monastical Life was quite different from that which is now seen at this day. For then they made no Vow of perpetual Chastity; they lived with the Labour of their Hands, and many of them were Married.

And St. Cyprian, l. 1. Epist. 9, c. 11. tells us, that the Virgins, who

Idolatrous, and Heretick. 100

who did Consecrate themselves unto God, that they might relieve the Poor, had the liberty of breaking their Vow of perpetual Chastity, when they thought, they might better serve God in the State of Marriage, than in that of Virginity.

Let us then conclude, since those, who contrary to Christ's Doctrine, and the Law of Nature persecute, and cause Men to die, merely because they are not of their Opinion and Religion, are Cruel and Tyrannous; since those that do Worship the Creature for the Creator, are Idolaters; and since those, that do add to the Word of God, and diminish from it several Articles both of Faith and Practice, are Hereticks.

The *Roman* Church, contrary to Christ's Doctrine and the Law of Nature, Persecuting and causing Men to Die, merely because they are not of her Opinion, and Practice.

1817
31956
... the Creature for
... and adding to the
... of God, and diminishing
... several Articles of Faith and
... it doth evidently follow,
... is Tyrannous, Idolatrous
... Heretick.

FINIS.

